From: Derek Deeter
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/23/02 5:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I don't think the proposed Microsoft Settlement goes far enough to remedy the monopolistic situation. I agree with the statements put forward in Dan Kegel's Web Page (http://www.kegel.com/remedy/remedy2.html) and also his Open Letter to DOJ Re: Microsoft Settlement , with which I also agree. The proposed settlement does not go far enough in it's remedies to properly address solutions to the current situation.

In addition, I would also like to add that I find that Microsoft's practices have stifled operating system and application competitiveness to the point where they are growing larger by the day at the expense of competitors. Netscape was one of the first casualties and the list goes on - there should be some penalty to be paid for causing these casualties, and this does not seem to be addressed by the current settlement.

A proposed part of the settlement being considered was forcing Microsoft to supply schools with computer systems and software, but I believe this would be rewarding them for their behavior - it is quite well known that in order to promote software, giveaways to the educational sector produce loyal supporters of that software when they graduate to the commercial sector - this would be a bonus to Microsoft a few years from now, and thus would seem to be a reward rather than a punishment. I would recommend against such a proposal if it is or will be considered again.

Microsoft is so large that it can adopt a standard (HTML is a good example), then change it to it's own benefit without validation by the HTML standards group. An additional part of the settlement should say that Microsoft must abide by the published standards of the owning technical commitees and that any infractions are punishable by (fill in penalty here). This is another example where browsers can not be competitive - if execution of a standard is not consistent across applications, Microsoft has the benefit of providing more utility by bypassing standards or even promoting misusage of standards. By it's sheer size it is able to not only get away with this, but exacerbate the problem.

In addition, Microsoft products when going from version to version (such as Office Products), utilize updated output file formats which are incompatible with those from old products. This in itself is a normal practice, but as a monopolistic remedy I would suggest that for an

interim period, Microsoft be forced in their new products to also write the older file formats to maintain compatibility and allow competing products to be used without penalty of constant upgrades.

Thank you for taking the time to read this,
Derek Deeter
Sr. Software Developer

--
Derek & Cheryl Deeter   deeter.cd@verizon.net